DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 171 193 HE 011 259

AUTHOR Haines, Patricia Foster
TITLE The Ecology of Coeducational Opportunity: The Higher Education of American Women in Historical Perspective.
PUB DATE [79]
NOTE 39p.; Best copy available

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Coeducation; College Students; *Educational History; Educational Opportunities; Educational Policy; *Educational Practice; *Females; Higher Education; Males; Sex Differences; *Sex Role; Student Experience; *Womens Education
IDENTIFIERS *Cornell University NY

ABSTRACT

A case study of Cornell University in its formative years (1868-1900) is presented to suggest the value of the historical approach in understanding the problem of sex-role channeling in the coeducational environment. The case of Cornell illustrates how nineteenth century concepts of feminirity and masculinity were fundamental to evolution of both administrative policy and practice, as well as to a vibrant student culture which similarly reinforced, and elaborated upon, traditional societal values regarding 'appropriate' sex-role polarization. Since Cornell served as a major model for the development of collegiate coeducation throughout the nation, its history may be richly suggestive of the historical experience of students under coeducation in general. The overwhelming message transmitted by the different dimensions of the student experience was that women and men are essentially different and that their preparation needs during the college years are as different as their prospective roles in, and contributions to, adult society should be. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED171193

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Patricia Foster Haines

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

THE ECOLOGY OF COEDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY:

THE HIGHER EDUCATION OF AMERICAN WOMEN IN HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Patricia Foster Haines
Ph.D. Candidate
Graduate Faculty in Education
University of Pennsylvania

HE 011 259

(This paper may be quoted with permission of the author; question may be directed to Patricia Foster Haines, 1202 East State Street, Ithaca, New York, 14850)

THE ECOLOGY OF COEDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY:

THE HIGHER EDUCATION OF AMERICAN WOMEN IN HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

In the early 1970's, a group of prominent women's colleges startled the higher educational community by rejecting what had appeared to be an irreversible trend toward universal coeducation.[1] Smith, Wellesley, Mount Holyoke, and a number of smaller schools reaffirmed their traditional commitment to meeting the higher educational needs of women within a single-sex environment. Reports explaining the resistence to coeducation asserted that schools serving both men and women had "failed" the female half of the population; coeducational institutions, mirroring the male-dominent deference patterns prevalent in American society, encouraged a sense of second class citizenship in women. The separate college for women, they continued, could provide an atmosphere of unquestioned 'first class' status, where both formal academic and informal extra-curricular experiences could nurture a high expectation of achievement.[2]

In essence, the women's colleges were asserting that separate may be more equal, given the continuing, often non-verbal messages of inferiority that women receive in coeducational settings-- when it comes to preparing women for full use of their intellectual and leadership potential, separate institutions for women may approximate the opportunities available to men elsewhere more closely than under coeducation. If mixed-sex learning situations are inimical to the development of both personality and cognitive skills and attitudes conducive to assertion of leadership in women, the single-sex institution should remain an important option.

Recent research had suggested that colleges for women only historically may have contributed proportionately more graduates to the ranks of nationally recognized leaders than have either coordinate or coeducational schools. M.

Elizabeth Tidball's pivotal study of women in science strongly suggested this to be true. While reports on the status of women at numerous coeducational institutions stressed such formal, structural aspects as admission and financial aid policies, residence and social regulations, and the curriculum, Tidball posited that informal experiences within the collegiate environment -- access to female role-models; leadership in extra-curricular activities -- may have had a greater impact on women's propensity to assume leadership responsibilities than those more structural dimensions traditionally attracting the attention of reformers. Alexander Astin's work on environmental press certainly supports this position, with regard to college students in general; and the Carnegie Commission's report on Opportunities for Women in Higher Education underscored the importance of both informal and formal learning for women, that implicit dynamic of both academic and social learning that takes place within the parameters of collegiate identity.[3]

It is this dynamic which the women's colleges referred to as a 'climate of expectation" - that set of attitudes and unspoken messages about what constitutes appropriate and/or desirable behavior and aspiration for students. They echo Elizabeth Woodbridge's 1914 concern that this climate is, for women, more one of "unexpectation" than supportive, positive recognition of female potential.[4] The women's colleges claim that women have more room for both personal and intellectual growth when freed from competition with men -- competition stacked against them in the male-dominant coeducational institution.

This stance of the women's colleges, and the Tidball thesis, have been viewed as positing an either/or approach to critical evaluation - sometimes termed 'the single-sex/coeducation controversy'. But the real issue is not whether one environment is better than the other. Rather, we are concerned to identify those factors within the collegiate experience which

encourage the development of intellectual acuity, self-reliance, initiative, and assertion of individual preference and potential. If these factors are different for women and men, these differences should be understood, and compensated for in administrative policy. If various aspects of the learning experience transmit messages about what is 'appropriate' for women or men as members of gender categories rather than as promising individuals, those messages need to be decoded, and defused.

In this paper I would like to draw on a case study of Cornell University in its formative years (1868-1900), to suggest the value of the historical approach in understanding this problem of sex-role channeling in the coeducational environment. The case of Cornell illustrates how 19th century concepts of femininity and masculinity were fundamental to evolution of both administrative policy and practice, as well as to a vibrant student culture which similarly reinforced, and elaborated upon, traditional societal values regarding 'appropriate' sex-role polarization. Since Cornell served as a major model for the development of collegiate coeducation throughout the nation, its history may be richly suggestive of the historical experience of students under coeducation in general.

The protective separatist stance of the women's colleges in 1979 is intriguingly reminiscent of what educators in the last century termed "The Woman Question in Higher Education". The motives to separatism may be different, but the issues remain the same: what are the different 'needs' of women and men, as they prepare within the collegiate context for assumption of responsible adult roles? How do, or should, contemporary concepts of male and female intellectual, and social, characteristics and contributions affect academic policies? What is the function of higher education in relation to such issues, which are essentially social and political rather than intellectual? And, how can the higher educational environment - geography, buildings, curriculum, adult guidance, teaching styles, faculty-student relations, extra-curricular offerings, and provisions for health, physical education and

post-collegiate activities -- be engineered to maximize realization of individual as well as institutional and societal goals?[5]

As Jill Conway pointed out in Daedalus (Spring, 1974), generations of public faith in approximation of coeducational opportunity may have been ahistorical. Other historians -- Patricia Albjerg Graham, Joan Burstyn, Florence Howe -- have echoed Conway in pointing to the paucity of knowledge about the actual experience of women as students in higher education of all kinds, not just the elitist schools of the East. Their common assertion is that until we know where we have come from - where the 'roots' of American academe find their sustenance for the 1970's - we will not know where we may apply our efforts most profitably, in search of lasting equity for the future.[6]

Luckily for all those sensitive to the lessons of history, the 19th century was engagingly explicit about this 'Woman Question', particularly with regard to formal education. From the 1860's until 1920, controversy over whether and how the higher education of women should differ from that of men permeated both professional and popular literature. As Lawrence Veysey documented, it was during this period that the colonial college matured into the modern university, in terms of administrative structures, financing, and curricular philosophy. In recent years, social historians have begun to expand this focus on structural transitions, to explore how the values of both administrators and students influenced the evolution of what Burton Clark termed the "institutional saga" of each individual school, and of American higher education in general. Thus, along with formal policies and procedures, the reality of any institution is defined as much by sets of rituals and mythologies, a heritage of values and role-playing. And much of this work is coming from scholars concerned particularly with women in the academic

drama, as students as well as on the faculty. Recognition of the importance of students, and of the student culture as a significant force within the educational experience is a particularly important contribution.[7]

Much of this work is in pre-publication stages, in doctoral dissertations such as the one on which this paper is based. Some, however, have reached the scholarly consciousness through recent publication, and through presentation of papers and discussions at conferences. Ann Miller's published work, and David Allmendinger's papers at recent history conferences, have contributed important new information on the demographic identity of Bryn Mawr and Mount Holyoke College students. Allmendinger's work in particular explored new methods of ascertaining the social and educational background of these students, a crucial problem for 19th century educational historians, and essential for sorting out the impact of the collegiate experience from that of family and community. Charlotte Conable, Elaine Kendall, and Dorothy McGuigan have provided sketchy narratives on Cornell University, the "Seven Sister" women's colleges of the East, and the University of Michigan - raising more questions by omission of detail and documentation than they satisfy. Given the paucity of institutional histories which take the women's experience into account, these works were useful for opening new doors and titilating the historical imagination. All three, however, suffer from presentism in varying degrees, from the imposition of definitions of 'equality' appropriate for the 1970's on the motivations and behavior of both women and men in the 19th century. Such imposition of contemporary values on interpretation of the past may have rhetorical value, but it obscures the complexity of history, and lessens the viability of its lessons. Positing what is essentially an oppression model for explaining the apparent inequality of opportunity for women, these works also tend to view women students as passive recipients of administrative, male,

dictates, rather than as active agents contributing to the quality and structure of their own experience.[8]

Shauna Adix's work on the University of Utah takes the women's views of their own student experience, their self-concept and goals, more into account, and raises some interesting questions about the relationship of religious dogma and politics to emergent institutional opportunities for women. Roberta Frankfort's work on Wellesley and other women's colleges offers some important theoretical and social history frameworks for understanding the role of the separate woman's college in reinforcing 19th century doctrines of domesticity. A panel discussion at the recent History of Education Society meetings, in Chicago in October (1978), underscored what appears to be the central theme emerging from all of these studies: that the concept of Womanhood, as an all-pervasive construct for individual identity and social behavior, came to be institutionalized in both coeducational and single-sex schools for women, during this period of the late 19th and early 20th centuries.[9]

According to this conceptual framework, women and men were destined by God, nature, and/or societal consensus to play equally important but essentially different roles in the advancement of human civilization - an echo of Aristotle. Popular social Darwinist theories stressed increasing specialization of function as a sign of social as well as biological evolution toward perfection; and higher education, by separating values and goals according to the gender of the student, would contribute to fulfilment of humanity's destiny. What happened, in effect, was that the 19th century concept of 'true womanhood' -- Woman as genteel, non-assertive, dedicated to nurturance of others -- expanded from the traditional domestic sphere to encompass the social welfare of the American public. College education for women was to serve as the training ground for translating traditional values into the new, expanded

roles. By 1910, both institutional and periodical literature indicated a high degree of consensus regarding the primary function of collegiate education for women: production of a new breed of social leader, for nurturance of the American family, public as well as private. The "Woman from the College" was to marry, raise her own children, and work assertively to improve the quality of American life - through community philanthropy; such occupations as librarianship, nursing, social work, missionary work, teaching, and other services; and especially through the rearing of healthy, intelligent children, and the wifely support of a professional man.[10]

In another paper at this conference (Division of History and Historiography) I discussed the Cornell case in detail, illustrating how particular themes within the larger 'Woman Question' explicitly articulated with the development of formal coeducation. Since the Cornell model of coeducation was widely influential throughout the United States, this particular case may have suggestive value beyond the current elitist status of the University. In this other paper, my concern was to suggest that collegiate coeducation had, by 1900, evolved from a relatively simplistic policy of open admissions into a complex, sophisticated theoretical and administrative "system" for sex-role socialization.[11]

Rather than repeat these details, I would like to draw upon the Cornell case to speculate on how this institutional framework may have affected the coeducated woman of the early 20th century; and how its heritage may continue to affect American women today.

As I mentioned earlier, the formative years of Cornell -- 1868 to 1900 -- were also the formative years of collegiate coeducation. The first major

Eastern institution to welcome women, Cornell was a widely recognized, and elaborately self-conscious model for the adoption of coeducation at other schools. It provided a transition between the elitist traditions of the established men's schools of the East, and the emerging 'peoples'' colleges of the West. Its experiments with sexual as well as religious and curricular non-sectarianism provided important, and much acclaimed, evidence on which schools less well-endowed with money and courage could base administrative decisions.[12]

The 'saga' of women at Cornell thus began with a high level of self-consciousness, on the part of both institution and students. President Andrew Dickson White's 1872 report to the Board of Trustees in favor of adopting coeducation had been widely circulated and quoted, in the student as well as public press. Both White and the editor of the Cornell Era commented that the entire nation, as well as educators from Europe, would be watching the new university carefully, measuring the success or failure of this "dubious experiment", as coeducation was termed, on the basis of the behavior and achievement of Cornell's women - and men.[13] In breaking ground for Sage College, a luxurious dormitory for women students, Trustee Henry W. Sage proclaimed, in 1873, that this building would serve as a pledge to the nation's women that Cornell University would "Forever Maintain" (his capitals) equal facilities for women and men.[14] Editorials in the Era, picked up and reprinted at numerous other schools as well as by the public press, reminded the men that the success of coeducation rested to large degree on their shoulders: unless they really gave the women a chance, and actively welcomed them as equals into both clubs and classrooms, coeducation would be doomed before it began.[15]

Early women students saw themselves as pioneers, as clearing new paths

for all women. As Ellen Coit Brown, Class of 1884, put it, she and her sister classmates were "a group of serious-minded 'young ladies', very conscious of their responsibility, as fore-runners in the Woman Movement (sic), for the most perfect conduct and virtue unassailable."[16]

During these earliest years, President White consciously broke with the American collegiate tradition of viewing students as children, in need of constant supervision by tutors, faculty, and the institution. He spoke and wrote widely about the educative value of treating all students--female as well as male--as mature, responsible adults. His university would not stand in loco parentis, to guard the morals and manners as well as nurture the minds of its children. He was well aware of the revolutionary potential of this stance, particularly with regard to the women; but, he felt, the experience of finding one's own residence, arranging for one's own board, governing one's own social life in balance with academic studies - these were as essential to the process of learning to be a responsible, mature adult as anything that went on in the classroom. He appealed to the integrity of his academic family, particularly to their self-consciousness of pioneering in a new educational venture which challenged many established practices and values of American higher education. And it worked, mostly because of the force of his own personality. Despite rowdy mud rallies and the occasional, nearly ritual stealing of faculty fence gates, Cornell students appeared far less violent in their challenges to university authority than those at all-male schools such as Princeton and Yale, where discipline had become a serious problem. Both White and the Cornell men attributed this to the seriousness with which Cornellians approached their studies; to their higher ages; to their common sense of being on trial before the academic community --

and to the civilizing influence of women on the campus.[17]

Unfortunately, this spirit of common pioneer responsibility was short-lived. Like most enthusiastic movements, once institutionalized, the policy of depending on student integrity to uphold the good name of Cornell did not outlast 'success' in the new academic venture. By the mid-1880's, the University's finances were in solid shape, the student body was growing rapidly, and approbation over its non-traditional approach to non-sectarianism and curricular eclecticism was becoming the norm for the nation. With the increasing size of the student body came an increasingly elaborate student culture, which both pleased and puzzled the university authorities. President White's place as major domo of campus life gave way to student-initiated clubs, athletic teams, and fraternities - and, as White took increasingly extended leaves of absence for diplomatic missions abroad, the power gap was filled by Henry W. Sage. A conservative businessman, Sage became president of the Board of Trustees in 1880; and in effect, ruled Cornell as a personal empire until 1893.[18]

Sage viewed women students as his special investment, and deliberately separated them out for special attention - prompting resentment from the male students, against "privileged coeducation". Because women were physically weak, and needed nurturance of aesthetic sensibility more than muscle, they were excused from the military drill required by the federal government of all students in land-grant schools. Sage had built the splendid Sage College to protect the women from inclement weather and Ithaca's geography - no such facilities existed for the men. But Sage's motivation was based on ambivalent feelings about the proper place of women in academic endeavor; and, more importantly, about what they should 'do' with their training following graduation.[19]

Sage College was not intended merely to protect women from the steep hills and miasma of Ithaca weather. It was also essential to Sage's concept of women as needing protection in all aspects of their lives - protection from the freedom of choice represented by White's laissez-faire policies on student life; protection from the moral pressures of exposure to male students; and protection from their own tendencies to aspire beyond what was designed by nature to be their prime function in life - marriage and child-rearing. Sage's letters to White, and the tone of all of his writings as trustee, echo Dr. Edward Clarke's little book, Sex in Education. Clarke, a physician, was convinced that humans have a finite amount of creative energy; if women divert that energy from their bodies to their brains, not only do those individual women become sick and socially unproductive, but they also become reproductively infertile.[20]

Sage was explicit about not trusting the women to guard the propriety of their own behavior outside the classroom. He battled with President White for five years to install a matron in Sage College, who would regulate all non-academic behavior; and in 1884, he won. The trustees had voted in 1879 to institute residence requirements in Sage College, but White had blocked its implementation. The women students apparently preferred the greater freedom, and lesser expense, of boarding in the town; which left Sage's building more than half empty. He threatened to take Sage College away from the women, and put it to use as classrooms - which, he implied, would mean the end of coeducation at Cornell; and, by extension, a severe blow to women's chances at higher education across the nation.[21]

The trustees, under President White's signature, sent a circular to all Cornell women during the summer of 1884, justifying their decision to impose both residency requirements and elaborate social regulations, under a

matron. A group of alumnae reacted swiftly, with a flurry of letters both to White and to their classmates. In the year that followed, they drew up a formal "memorial", protesting the new regulations. According to Ellen Coit Brown Elliot, Class of 1884, these women saw the move as an insult to their own integrity, and to the honor of their future sisters at Cornell. Not only did the rules deny women's capacity for self-government, but they imposed the men's concept of proper female behavior, and educational goals, on their most proudly female sensibilities. More importantly, the move institutionalized discrimination in the treatment of women and men.[22]

Sage College, to which the women were now segregated, was located high above the town, on the Cornell campus. Given the absence of telephones, simple contact between women and men outside the classroom became very difficult, and strained. This geographical isolated reinforced the tendency to view women as a separate category; it also exacerbated a trend that was just then beginning, for non-academic activities to become increasingly sex-segregated. The spacious parlors, large dining rooms with regular meals and guarded diet, the indoor gymnasium, and (this was a cause celebre among the men) indoor bathtubs made the ambiance of daily life for women quite different than that for men. Male students, for the most part, resided in private boarding houses in the town below the campus, with drafty, cramped rooms; and they had a hard time trudging through the mud ruts, up Buffalo Street hill, to make 8:15 a.m. classes. Sage College was quiet, protected, and gracious - just what Henry Sage believed appropriate for inculcating tastes and genteel behavior in women. Men, he felt, needed the rigors of independence, mud and all, to strengthen them to meet the challenges of the world outside; drafty rooms and uphill trudges would make Men of them, and were as important to their college education as anything learned in the

classroom.[23]

Of course, by 1900, fraternity houses and new dormitories for men nearer to the campus provided this graciousness for the men as well - but under their own impetus, and their own governance. President White and other faculty members gave lectures on art and music in Sage College's parlors; the Trustees allocated respectable sums of money for the women to learn how to give formal receptions, in these same parlors - as part of their collegiate training. The men were expected to provide for their own cultural enrichment.

Cornell elaborately eschewed discrimination in all other areas of educational policy; residentiality, and social regulations, set the framework for women's separation from the mainstream of campus life efficiently enough. While the University of Chicago and other lesser schools were backtracking from their original commitment to "equality" for women, as meaning offering the same academic and non-academic learning opportunities for both sexes, Cornell defended "equality" by pointing to the lack of formal restrictions on curricular choice and extra-curricular activities that were officially open to all students.[24]

What other schools had viewed as necessary imposition of segregation, to protect both women and men from themselves as well as from each other, was accomplished at Cornell by the emergent student culture. By the mid-1880's the pioneer calls for joint responsibility, and welcoming women as equals, had given way to hostility and ritual avoidance of women by the numerically dominant male student body. The men expressed first surprise and puzzlement, then eventually anger at the women's reluctance to accept their genuine welcome into social and intellectual clubs and activities. They chastised the "Fair Cornelliennes" for refusing to accept nominations to campus political offices - as members of the student community, they felt, women should be

more willing to accept leadership responsibilities, according to an editorial in the Cornell Era in November, 1872.[25]

During the 1880's the fraternity and sorority systems took hold; and competitive athletics emerged from the mud rallies into full-fledged ritual combat, with the honor of the institution at stake. Student politics achieved recognized stature as an avenue of influence not only during the collegiate years, but following graduation as well. As the student body grew bigger, the proportion of women students remained almost the same. As in any social organization experiencing rapid growth, rituals of authority, stratification among categories, and sub-group identity took on new importance. The pattern of male and female participation in extra-curricular activities, supposedly open to both sexes, increasingly tended toward segregation - perhaps as much by choice on the part of the women as by exclusivity on the part of the men. In the 1880's, both sexes increasingly established their own, new, separate organizations - fraternities, musical and debating societies, class organizations, religious study groups. In coeducational organizations, parallel structures for decision-making arose; the Christian Association is the most striking example - with a male president, and both male and female vice-presidents, to serve the interests of the different constituencies. Some class and organizational offices gradually came to be designated for the women - second-vice president; corresponding secretary; class essayist or poet. In 1893, and again in 1897, the women organized campaigns to win a place for one of their number on the yearbook editorial staff (a more influential position than one in class government); but in general they did not even try for leadership positions outside their own separate activities. Male calls for female participation in campus politics by 1888 rested not on taking equal responsibility for leadership, as in the 1870's, but rather on making contributions

to the crew fund.[26]

In the 1890's, frequent editorials in the Era point out how college offices prepare men for assumption of leadership in the outside world; and when they said 'men', they meant male, not humankind in general. I found no such statements about impetus for women to assume leadership positions, even within their own organizations. Sorority presidents, in the 1880's, ran social meetings on the floor of dormitory rooms, and were responsible for the chocolate cake; by the 1890's, they held their meetings in professorial homes, and occasionally represented Cornell at national sorority conferences. But they did not meet with faculty and trustees to discuss university policies, as did representatives of the men's organizations. And when they attended national Christian Association meetings, in the 1890's, they traveled with their female friends, and attended sessions for women only.[27]

Social life, or male-female interaction outside both class and clubroom, passed similarly from the hands of both women and men into those of the men. Early dances, in the 1870's, were open to the entire University community, and were attended by faculty, trustees, townspeople, and students alike. Since the religious affiliations of many students and faculty discouraged dancing, it was actually the literary society which served the most useful function as a social exchange. By the 1880's, the literary clubs were dying - accompanied by elaborate mourning by the student press, and faculty, who saw the demise of the literary guilds as heralding the end of the collegiate way of life. As crew and football, and formal dancing parties, took their place, it was the social rather than intellectual force which came to govern extra-curricular life on the campus.[28]

And both sports and elaborate dances were male-initiated, male-

controlled. The women may or may not be invited as guests; but they had no part in planning or executing such events - as they had with earlier literary debates. Partially in response to feeling excluded from these supposedly campus-wide events, the women increased the formality of their own, separate social whirl. They gave formal receptions for their female friends, as well as for faculty and trustees. They organized their own dances, both for their female friends and for mixed-groups - and both kinds were accepted as normal and desirable. They danced in the Sage gymnasium every night after dinner, until the trustees put a stop to it - not because it was 'unnatural' for women to dance together, but because it was too rowdy, and interfered with their studies. In the 1890's, some of the women organized an 'anti-Prom', complete with long gowns, an orchestra, and corsages - for all those who had not been invited to the "Junior".[29]

There is some suggestion that these women saw this tendency toward separatism in student life as a positive aspect of their collegiate experience, rather than completely as a source of humiliation. Their own separate 'sphere' within the larger, male, community had its own integrity, served their interests and needs, and allowed them considerable freedom of expression. While they enjoyed the Military Ball and fraternity parties - to which they were invited in larger numbers than popular Cornell mythology would admit - they also clearly found great enjoyment from activities with female friends. In 1895, for example, Adelaide Taber Young commented to her mother about an all-female dance at Sage College, "I had as good (if not better) a time as I ever had at a party where there were men." As the women wrote home about the events of daily life, they seem to have felt that being a woman was special; and that their own, separate, world was especially nice.[30]

The official residential set-up also provided a set of formal role-

models. The matron was hired in the early 1880's to supervise the cleanliness and efficiency of Sage College's management; her husband ran the dining room. Later in the decade, this position became that of the Lady Principal, the Warden, and eventually the Dean of Women. The first Lady Principal was a widow, hired explicitly because she had traveled widely in Europe, had been the wife of a diplomat, and was unquestionably a Lady. Her successor was allowed to teach Bible classes, and was encouraged by the Trustees to make the cultural enrichment offerings of Sage College increasingly elaborate. In the 1890's, the Lady Principal graduated to the Warden, an honorific title borrowed from Oxford by President Jacob Gould Schurman, to indicate increased status. The first Warden had a Ph.D. in English and Greek from Bryn Mawr, and was appointed Instructor in English, an ex-officio member of the faculty. President Schurman hailed her advent as recognition that women had as much right to teach as to study; but she was not allowed a place on the faculty Senate. Her successor was not allowed to teach at first; she was, in fact, warned not to allow her "researches" in psychology to interfere with her attention to the non-academic welfare of her 'girls'.[31]

The question of role-models at Cornell during these early years is very important, but difficult to assess in the Tidball thesis sense - history is not a 'hard' science. Given the lack of faculty women, we need to expand the concept of role-models to include faculty wives, graduate student women, alumnae, female administrators, and vicarious models urged on the student consciousness by visiting lecturers, and the student press.

Faculty wives were hostile to women students in the earliest years. But as younger faculty began marrying college-educated women, "Mrs. Professor" became an important part of the social life of the campus. These women were cultured, educated, and genuinely interested in helping women students, particularly

through sorority activities. Some were amateur scholars, acquiring national reputations in their fields; but they were still known to their student friends of both sexes as "Mrs. Professor". Letters from women students to their families - and comments in the student press - indicate that both women and men appreciated these "faculty ladies" who combined educated sensibilities with marriage and child-rearing.[32]

Women graduate students, sharing residency and social restrictions with the undergraduates, became more important after the Cornell Medical School required its women to study in Ithaca rather than New York for the first two years of their course (1893). Each graduate student fellowship appears to have been hailed as a triumph for all women of the University, and the earlier spirit of pioneering "sisterhood" which had informed the alumnae protest of 1885 was kept alive by the aspirations of these graduate student women. Their fields of study ranged from literature to the biological sciences, from architecture to engineering. Some were laboratory and teaching assistants; many won academic awards. Most importantly for the undergraduate women, they were an integral part of the community of women, in Sage College - and in the 1890's, in the sorority houses and smaller dormitories as well.[33]

There is little evidence that the women questioned the lack of female faculty. When this did become an issue, after 1900, it was the alumnae, not the students, who fought to gain recognized status for women on the faculty. The strongest resistence came from the Arts Faculty; but the general attitude expressed by records of faculty meetings, and in correspondence of University officials, was that it may be all right for women to study, even to teach - but not to have explicit, recognized, equal decision-making power with the male faculty. When women did gain a foothold, it was in an area explicitly intended to serve the female population -- Domestic Economy. Thus, when women

did appear as faculty role-models on campus, they were still segregated from the mainstream of professional identity, serving women's separate 'needs', and representing fields of study designed explicitly for women students.[34]

Vicarious role-models for female achievement were offered deliberately by the trustees, the Lady Principal, and various women's organizations, in the persons of numerous speakers, alumnae, aunts and sisters - all of whom would come and stay in Sage College from one day to several weeks. The most frequent outside speakers represented the College Settlement Movement, or foreign missionary work. Alumnae came frequently, particularly from the New York City alumnae organization; and they were explicitly concerned to keep on eye on the progress of women students, and on Cornell's treatment of its daughters. There was a clear aura of academic maternalism in this, a sense that without their watchfulness, the needs of women students might get swallowed up in the larger, increasingly bureaucratic priorities of the University.[35]

The continual references in the student press to milestones by women in academia and the professions are a curious indication of the pervasive interest in changing roles for women, at least on the part of the men who wrote for the newspaper. They may have provided another kind of vicarious role-model, for both women and men. The achievements of individual women were, like the fellowships and awards of graduate student women, proclaimed as achievements for Womankind - as evidence that the predominant view of woman as intellectually inferior to men may be erroneous. However, singled out for attention in this way, such achievement may have been notable more as an exception than as a rule. Each new open door was heralded as a sign of progress toward equality for women; but it was conspicuous for anomoly status.[36]

Compared to the numbers of women playing active roles in the world of the all-female college of this period, this roster seems pitifully small. What

may be more significant than the number, however, in terms of influencing achievement or leadership propensities in women students, was the type of model. Most of the women in the Cornell community were domestically-oriented. If they achieved recognition for intellectual contributions, it was essentially defined as amateur - unpaid, culled out of 'spare' time - in status. As women entered the faculty, as noted above, they were in 'woman's'fields. Outside speakers represented service occupations and organizations, emphasizing traditionally female values of self-abnegation and nurturance, rather than competition and achievement in traditional male terms.

By 1900 coeducational schools were under fire not for "failing" to produce women leaders, but rather for jeopardizing women's divinely (or evolutionary) designated predilection for following socially prescribed roles.[37] Domestic role-models, therefore, were more desirable from the institution's standpoint, for they aroused less public approbation, and did not scare away tuition-paying parents. And they may have been more desirable from the perspective of women students as well. Home and community were still the primary goals held by as well as for women during this time. Even the Woman's Rights Movement, which claimed equal rights--same rights--as their goal in the 1860's, had evolved into the Woman Suffrage Movement, with its stress on the unique, separate, different identity of Woman as a moral force to improve the quality of American life, through the vote. The extension of home and community into the public sphere, via the new fields of sociology and Domestic Economy (later called Home Economics) in particular, served as a release valve for both institutions and male faculty, and for women students. It certainly relieved the anxieties of male academic, social and political leaders forecasting the demise of American culture through "feminization" of higher education.

Many of the same alumnae who protested the trustee imposition of residence

restrictions in 1885 contributed to a remarkably different document in 1895. The "Tribute to Henry W. Sage" was a direct response to contemporary criticisms of coeducation as diverting women from their "proper" domestic sphere, and it illustrates the sensitivity of Cornell's women to their role in the ongoing controversy. This document, signed by most of the women who had attended Cornell up to that time, thanked Trustee President Sage for holding "the doors of the University open to women through days of doubt and discouragement". Because of Sage's munificence, and abiding interest in the welfare of women students, they would no longer be forced by "defective training...(to) be unfit to train and guide the marvelous mind of a child in the school or in the home."[38]

Much has been made, both by historians of higher education and in popular collegiate mythology, of male hostility toward "coeds". Anti-female editorials, jokes, cartoons, and comments did abound at Cornell by the late 1880's; but they seem to have originated, and were deliberately and elaborately perpetuated by a few, elitist fraternities and athletic leaders. Whether these vocalists represented a majority male view is unclear. But it also perhaps irrelevant. The powerfuly mythology that came to dominate popular notions of coeducational collegiate life, based on this publicity, may have influenced both male and female perceptions of what constituted "appropriate" behavior and aspiration in campus life more than actual experience. It rapidly became chic to put down 'coeds' as stout, unfeminine, and bookish; and the term 'coed' itself came to have derogatory associations. But while some men drew ugly cartoons for the yearbook, and deliberately nurtured "the myth of the ugly Cornell Coed", others took women friends on long jaunts into the country, laughed and sang with women students long into the night, and clearly enjoyed the chance to share the frequent 'spreads', puddings and

fudges made in Sage College chafing dishes. And Cornell men, like their coeducated brothers elsewhere, did marry their female classmates in large numbers.[39]

All these dimensions of the student experience - official policies; geography; non-academic lessons of the student culture; athletics and social life; role-models; ritual mythologies of sex-role status - reinforced each other. All contributed to an irresistable momentum within the collegiate environment, propelling both women and men toward polarized ends of the expectation and aspiration spectrum. The importance of one cannot be understood without recognition of interdependence with the others - this is what the title of this paper refers to as the "ecology" of coeducational opportunity.

The overwhelming messages transmitted by these various environmental factors or forces was that women and men are essentially different; and that their preparation 'needs' during the college years are as different as their prospective roles in, and contributions to, adult society should be. On the surface it was not a question of inferiority or superiority. Educational theorists had puzzled over whether women were physically and intellectually capable of the same rigorous attention to academic study as men; but the women students paid more attention to their studies than to such theor and quickly demonstrated not only equal but superior capacity in many fields. In fact, they did so well that the reaction to coeducation by 1900, the anti-coeducation movement typified by Chicago's backtracking, was based not on fear that women would undermine the quality of scholarship. Rather, their success jeopardized the self-image and achievement propensities of men, particularly in the traditional liberal arts fields.[40]

In all of the theoretical and administrative literature, there is a

clear tone of ambiguity, anxiety, and bewilderment - women were a problem, a puzzle; they just did not fit into the established paradigms of academic administrative thought. They did not fit into the traditional scheme of purpose and function for higher education; and they did not fit into the administrative mode, whereby men made decisions about the proper nurturance of other men into professional and leadership roles. Women were the Other - there were Cornell students; then Cornell women students - two separate categories. Both men and women were constantly reminded of this categorical separation of identity and status by official policies, commentary in the student press, lectures on table manners at Sage College dinners, debates in fraternity meetings over whether to allow 'coeds' at parties - by a general, all-pervasive atmosphere of self-consciousness regarding what was "appropriate" differentiation of sex-role identity and behavior. This self-consciousness in itself must have been as oppressive as the content of the theories, for both men and women.

The only way either sex could escape from such role awareness was to affirm the value of separate male and female spheres within the larger collegiate community. Since the men were predominant in numbers, leadership, financial supports, and academic paradigms, their sphere was seen as the norm. Women were the anomaly; and their separate world clung precariously to the periphery of campus life.

As I mentioned earlier, there is evidence that the women themselves did not view this as ascribed outcast status. There is a clear tone of pride in their own separateness, and a sense of their common identity as positive. It may be argued that such an attitude was response to ghetto-mentality, a defense mechanism against the pain of being left out. However, we may do these women a disservice by insisting that their role in the segregated

student culture was inferior. They may have chosen such separation as an expression of social identity which we will know all too little about until historians look more closely at the female perspective, rather than institutional or predominately male-oriented versions of life on American college campuses. Certainly this polarization reflected the reality of adult social interaction at this time of American history, when differentiation rather than integration of the sexes was becoming increasingly elaborate in both theory and practice.[41]

In 1907, Ida Shaw Martin pointed to three components of leadership which sorority life attempted to foster in women: self-confidence; self-control; and self-sacrifice. With the exception of the last, fraternities had the same goals for their members. Sororities, Martin felt, were important because they provided opportunities not available elsewhere in the co-educational university environment. Living and working with one's sisters provided the "courage to dare", a "consciousness of power", essential to assertion of leadership in adult life - but impossible to develop in the male-dominant culture of the coeducational university.[41a]

The separate Women's World at Cornell may have served this purpose, providing a degree of exercise in self-determination not possible had they been truly integrated into the student community, as Andrew Dickson White envisioned in the 1870's. This separation may have been essential for fostering a "consciousness of power" over their own lives.

But it was still an externally-monitored self-determination - women could regulate their own lives, their own behavior, set their own goals, only within parameters carefully guarded by the male administration. Women students, no matter how much they enjoyed the company of their sisters at Sage, had little other choice than segregation - either at Cornell, or in American society at

that time. The University's early determination to provide the nation with "more womanly women" and "more manly men" reverberated through every aspect of student experience. In the early years, it was explicit; but by 1903, President Schurman declared coeducation a closed issue, such a "success' that it no longer required, or deserved, so much critical attention. The controversy died down; but the values, the implicit pressures toward segregation, remained. Unexamined, they became such an integral part of campus ambiance that no one questioned their influence - until the 1960's. Women students could not escape their primary identity as Women. Only within their own separate world could they explore what ability and preference might emerge if they deviated from the prescribed script for social role behavior, and educational goals.

The very success of the separate women's world may have blocked a crucial transition inherent in President White's insistence on "equality" of opportunity of meaning identical freedom of choice, both in and out of the classroom. The early women students were conscious of a pioneering sisterhood, of affirming both female capacities and rights to college education; but they never carried it beyond this, to the assertive feminism proclaimed by the women's colleges of the 1970's as the desirable goal. The alumnae protest of 1885 was a defense of the integrity of women's ability--and right--to determine the parameters of their own collegiate experiences. By 1895, both female students and alumnae had accepted the trustees' - the male - prescription of "appropriate" female goals and behavior. But it was no longer just a male view - the women had internalized the values, and made them their own. Once both women students and alumnae appeared to agree with the trustees as to what did constitute "appropriate" behavior and goals, the reins of decision-making passed readily into the hands of female administrators -

the Warden, the Adviser, and eventually the Dean of Women. When one of these female administrators deviated from the party line, she was fired - as was the case with Gertrude Martin, in 1915.[42]

Elizabeth Fox-Genovese recently pointed out that sisterhood and feminism are not necessarily the same. Sisterhood is bonding into support groups, evidenced by solidarity of appreciation for the unique strengths of one's female friends. It enables women to resist, to survive, and even to transcend the discrimination and insidious put-downs which our society imposes through the media, literature, and interpersonal relations both at home and on the job. But it does not move beyond this level, toward opening opportunities for all women. The homosocial support group is important, enriching, immeasurably enjoyable; but it does not, in itself, institute change in the more fundamental ecology of hererosocial relationships and power structures.[43]

When historians puzzle over why American women worked so hard to get the vote, and then apparently went home to their families, they are talking about the failure of feminism, not of sisterhood. Mid-19th century feminism challenged the fundamental tenets of male-female difference, positing a world in which individual ability and preference - rather than societal prescription - would dictate the contributions offered to social progress by both women and men. By 1900, however, organized 'feminism' had evolved into 'domestic' or 'social' feminism - rather than challenging the sexual status quo, leaders of the women's movement justified their political activities as asserting woman's unique, separate identity, her value as complement to man, rather than competitor. Those fighting for the vote wanted to have women use suffrage as a vehicle for readjusting social priorities, rather than urge women themselves into the immediate political arena, as office holders. Under this domesticated form of feminism, or extended sisterhood, the traditional

view of sex-role polarization, reinforced by social Darwinism, was not only upheld, but institutionalized - women were 'naturally' good at some things, men at others; training both sexes to strengthen these natural abilities was to ensure progress toward social perfection. Women deserved respect and recognition because their unique strengths were of essential value to human society; they deserved equal respect, for separate social identities.[44]

This was essentially what Andrew Dickson White, Henry Sage, and Jacob Gould Schurman of Cornell were saying with regard to goals for coeducation. White, in 1872, proclaimed that coeducation would strengthen the American family by encouraging mutual recognition and respect for the complementary strengths of both sexes - by making women more womanly, and men more manly. In 1903, when Schurman proclaimed that this goal was being realized through both the formal administrative structures and the informal lessons of life in Sage College, he lable coeducation an indubitable "success". The "system" of coeducation at Cornell would assure that women students would not ruin their reproductive health by over-study; would not weaken the academic integrity of the institution by inferior learning; would not jeopardize the social and moral integrity of Cornell by scandelous behavior, mostly sexual; and would contribute trained sensibilities toward solution of pressing problems in the quality of American life -through appropriately female occupations, and the family.[45]

I would like to suggest - not conclude, but suggest - that this institutionalizing of domestic rather than the more radical, equal rights feminism may be partially responsible for the failure of the 19th century women's movement to achieve genuine social revolution in the respective perquisites of the sexes. Cornell's patriarchs talked openly of their fear of 'strong-

minded women'. Henry Sage asked President White whether they couldn't just expel the more "radical" women from the campus, as a bad influence on both male and female students. Later, as Trustee President, Sage deliberately chose women who fit his stereotype of the "true woman" to set up the Women's Self-Government Association, and to serve as Lady Principal, Warden, etc. Sage more than any other administrative force during the formative years of Cornell worked explicitly to block 19th century equal rights feminism from entering the University's doors; coeducation, as he determined it, would deliberately channel the nation's women away from such radical, dangerous, and inappropriate ideals, toward realization of their true, womanly nature, and the value of their unique, womanly contributinns to society through traditional support roles.[46]

From the students' perspective, experience within the separate women's world at Cornell may have been satisfying, and may have prepared them for a degree of financial independence otherwise impossible. But experience with leadership in all-female organizations did not prepare women for competing with men beyond the ivy walls. Women learned that it was admirable to lead other women; but not men. This at least appears to have been the lesson of student politics at Cornell. The "courage to dare" may have been limited to assertion and achievement among one's sisters. Competing with men would have taken a completely different set of rules, which clearly were not part of the affective curriculum at early Cornell.

By 1890, 43% of American post-secondary institutions were formally open to both women and men. By 1910, this figure had risen to 58%, by 1930 to 69%, and by 1970 to 86.1%. By 1973, coeducational institutions enrolled 97% of all post-secondary students, both male and female.[47] If as the Cornell case suggests, both women and men in coeducational institutions were

socialized into a specific set of values and behavioral patterns which divided rather than united their aspirations and interests, the vast majority of educated Americans may have ended up affirming these values. There will always be those who resist academic socialization; but for the most part, definitions of 'success' learned in college, particularly relating to occupational roles, inform both self-concept and actual behavior in later years. If the environmental press of the coeducational university projects different definitions of 'success' for women and men, both are being channeled toward assumption of roles and responsibilities which may fit social role prescription rather than their individual abilities and preferences. Sex-role polarization denies both women and men development and expression of unique potential; and it denies society the benefits of leadership based on the entire spectrum of human talent.

From the perspective of the 19th and early 20th century, reinforcing sex-role polarization through the collegiate process was a positive, desirable, even evolutionarily necessary goal. To say that these educators -- both male and female - "failed" the nation's women illustrates the poverty of historical presentism - of imposing the value priorities and conceptual frameworks and definitions of the present on understand of the past. Concepts of equality have changed; and procedures for translating theory into practice have become buried under decades of bureaucratic mythology. Institutions are slow to change. They follow inner directives, complex multidimensional agendas, deeply rooted in their historical experience, and in their sense of historic mission.

Until the values, practices, mythologies, and rituals of academic life - both in and out of the classroom - are examined more closely, with the variable of gender clearly in mind, efforts to make higher education a truly liberating

experience for both women and men will fall short. Sex-role options for both sexes are expanding, accompanied by excrutiating growing pains. Both men and women need active support and encouragement for exploring their human potential, for both competition and nurturance. The 19th century separatist prescription for collegiate success was just as imprisoning for men as for women - though the bars may have been invisible, and the prison food more palatable. In the long run - which is now - the 'gender trap' has blocked men as well as women from perceiving and experiencing the full range of human satisfactions and contributions. It interferes with mutuality and interdependence between the sexes, both in the family and on the job.

If coeducation, as the predominant form of higher education for both women and men in America, has contributed to this polarization, it is time to root out those mechanisms which reinforce differentiation - and replace them with others more closely in line with expanding realities. This can only be done by searching out the historical molds, motivations, and mythologies that constitute the "saga" of the modern academic scene - in order that educators for the 1980s and beyond may see more clearly how higher education may serve the needs of both women and men, as they prepare for leadership of a troubled world.[48]

FOOTNOTES

[1] W. Vance Grant, "Trend in Higher Education is Toward Coeducation," Digest of Educational Statistics, 1973 Edition, p. 91.

In 1973, Smith College, Wellesley College, Mount Holyoke College, Wells College, and a number of other women's colleges concluded lengthy studies of the desirability and feasibility of becoming coeducation, as had Vassar, Yale, and Princeton. Since this time, they have joined together in the Women's College Coalition, an organization of sixty schools.

[2] Unpublished report, Committee on Coeducation, Dr. Eli Chinoy, Chairman, Smith College; Report of the President, Smith College, 1972-73; Barbara Newell, "Separate Education for Women?", Wellesley Alumnae Magazine, Spring, 1973; Matina Horner, "The Last Hundred Years: Changing Perspectives," Address at Smith College Centennial Celebration, October, 1974 (Smith College Archives).

[3] M. Elizabeth Tidball's article "Perspective on Academic Women and Affirmative Action" (Education Record 54: 130-135, Spring, 1973) first appeared as "Some Institutional Factors Associated With the Probability of Career Success," paper presented at the American Association for the Advancement of Science, December 27, 1972. Tidball's observations are confirmed, with reservations, by Mary J. Oates and Susan Williamson, in "American Higher Education and the Career Choices of Women Achievers, 1900-1975," paper presented at the Third Berkshire Conference on the History of Women, Bryn Mawr College, June, 1976. A revised version of this paper was published in SIGNS, Summer, 1978.

Alexander Astin, Four Critical Years (1977); Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, Opportunities for Women in Higher Education, Their Current Participation, Prospects for the Future, and Recommendations for Action (NY: McGraw Hill Book Company, 1973). See, in addition, W.T. Furniss and P.A. Graham, eds., Women in Higher Education (Washington, D.C.: 1972); and Alexander Astin, "The American Freshman: National Norms for Fall, 1977", research report available from the Graduate School of Education, UCLA.

[4] Elizabeth Woodbridge, "The Unknown Quantity in the Woman Problem," Atlantic Monthly CXII: 510-520 (April, 1914).

[5] The best single sources providing perspectives on this 'Woman Question in Higher Education' are James Orton, ed., The Liberal Education of Women: The Demand and the Method. Current Thoughts in America and England (New York: A.S. Barnes and Company, 1873); Willystine Goodsell, The Education of Women, Its Social Background and Its Problems (New York: 1924); and, of course, Thomas Woody, A History of Women's Education in the United States (New York: 1929). For an excellent primary review of how contemporary theory influenced institutional development, see David Starr Jordan, "The Woman and the University," in The Voice of the Scholar, with Other Addresses on the Problems of Higher Education (San Francisco: 1903).

6 Jill K. Conway, "Coeducation and Women's Studies: Two Approaches to the Question of Woman's Place in the Contemporary University," Daedalus (Fall, 1974): 239-249.

Patricia Albjerg Graham, "Expansion and Exclusion: A History of Women in Higher Education," SIGNS (Summer, 1978); Joan W. Burstyn, "Woman and Education: A Survey of Recent Historical Research," Educational Leadership 31 (November, 1973); Florence Howe, "The History of Women and Higher Education," Journal of Education (August, 1977); Jill K. Conway, "Perspectives on the History of Women's Education in the United States," History of Education Quarterly XIV (Spring, 1974).

7 Articles on 'The Woman Question' in education appeared in such diverse journals as Christian Union, Popular Science Monthly, Scribners, and Godey's Ladies Book.

For example, see: Samuel Warren Dike, "Sociology in the Higher Education of Women," Atlantic Monthly (1892); Alice Puffer Howes, "Accepting the Universe," Atlantic Monthly (April, 1922); Gertrude Shorb Martin, "The Education of Women and Sex Equality," Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science LVI (November, 1914); James S. Kennedy, "Identical Education and Co-Education," New England Journal of Education II (July, 1875).

Lawrence Veysey, The Emergence of the American University (Chicago: 1975); Burton R. Clark, The Distinctive College (Chicago: 1970).

8 Ann Miller, ed., A College in Dispersion: Women of Bryn Mawr, 1896-1975 (Boulder, Colorado: 1976); David Allmendinger, paper presented at Annual Meeting, Organization of American Historians, New York, April, 1978. Charlotte Williams Conable, Women at Cornell: The Myth of Equal Education (Ithaca; 1977); Elaine Kendall, Peculiar Institutions (1977); Dorothy McGuigan, A Dangerous Experiment: 100 Years of Women at the University of Michigan (Ann Arbor: 1970).

9 Shauna Adix, "Differential Treatment of Women at the University of Utah from 1850 to 1915," Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Utah, 1976; and Adix, "Education for Women: The Utah Legacy," Journal of Education (August, 1977); Roberta Frankfort, Collegiate Women: Domesticity and Career in Turn of the Century America (New York; 1977).

See also: Roberta Wein, "Women's Colleges and Domesticity, 1875-1918," History of Education Quarterly XIV, 1 (Spring, 1974); Keith Melder, "Mask of Oppression: The Female Seminary Movement in the United States," New York History LX (July, 1974).

Panelists at the History of Education Society meetings included Mary Cookingham (University of California, Berkeley), Lynn Gordon (University of Chicago), and Sally Schwager (Harvard University).

10 See, for an overview, Woody, op. cit., Volume II. For examples of contemporary views, see: James William, "The Social Value of the College Bred," Publications of the Association of Collegiate Alumnae, Series III (1908); Helen J. Ferris, "The New World and the College Woman," Bookman XLII (February, 1916) (followed by a series of articles in response, in March, April, and May); M.F. Armstrong, "Mission of the Educated Woman," Popular Science Monthly 36

(1890); William D. Hyde, The College Man and the College Woman (Boston: 1906); Elizabeth McCracken, The Women of America (New York: 1903), Chapter VI: "The Woman From the College".

11 Patricia Foster Haines, "Collegiate Womanhood: The 'Woman Question' in American Higher Education, 1870-1910," Division F (History and Historiography). This paper is based on research for a dissertation in progress for the University of Pennsylvania, "Coeducation and the Cultivation of Womanhood: Perspectives from Cornell University, 1868-1900".

12 The correspondence of Andrew Dickson White, first president of Cornell, contains numerous requests for copies of his Report Submitted to the Trustees of Cornell University in Behalf of a Majority of the Committee on Mr. Sage's Proposal to Endow a College for Women (Albany, 1872). Woody refers to Cornell as one of the prime models for women's higher education - along with Oberlin, the University of Michigan, and the University of Wisconsin. White's letters contain material documenting in particular Cornell's influence on the University of Pennsylvania, and Stanford University (Cornell University Archives).

I am indebted for the term "sexual non-sectarianism" to an editorial in the Cornell Era in October, 1872.

13 Andrew Dickson White, speech in Proceedings at the Laying of the Cornerstone of the Sage College of the Cornell University, May 15, 1873 (Ithaca: 1873); Angelo Mosso, The Education of Woman in the United States, Studies on America (translated from the Italian by Olga Josie Hansen) San Francisco: 1902); Cornell Era, November 1, 1872.

14 Henry W. Sage, speech in Proceedings at the Laying of the Cornerstone... (Ithaca: 1973).

15 See, for example, Cornell Era, November 8, 1872; September 29, 1876; and November 22, 1878.

16 Ellen Coit Brown, Elliot collection, Cornell University Archives, listed as "Sage College Memorial".

17 See White, Report Submitted to the Trustess of Cornell University....; Annual Report of the President, Presented to the Board of Trustees Wednesday June 20, 1883; Annual Report.... 1885; Cornell Era, series of editorials in response to criticisms of coeducation, and of Cornell, from other college newspapers, October - June, 1872-73.

18 Sage and White debated the issue of student governance at length - but, unfortunately, their discussions were mostly over the dinner table at White's home in Ithaca. References to these discussions are made in correspondence, from both sides, between 1870 and 1885 (Cornell University Archives).

19 Ellen Coit Brown Collection; Henry W. Sage, speech in Proceedings at the Laying of the Cornerstone....; Sage and White, Circular to Women Students,

ECBE collection; for a detailed discussion of Sage's views, and his conflict with White, see Patricia Foster Haines, "For Honor and Alma Mater: Perspectives on Coeducation at Cornell University, 1868-1885," Journal of Education (August, 1977).

An editorial entitled "Privileged Coeducation" appeared in the Cornell Era on October 4, 1878. It was prompted by the refusal of the Board of Trustees to allow women to adopt military uniforms and participate in the drills required of all students at Morrill Land Grant schools. It should be noted that the women had petitioned for uniforms and their own military formations, but the trustees felt that such activities would be "inappropriate" for them (Minutes of the Cornell University Board of Trustees for 1878, Cornell University Archives).

20 Sage and White, Circular to Women Students, 1884; Edward Clarke, Sex in Education, or, A Fair Chance for the Girls (Boston: 1873). Dr. Clarke's little book prompted an enormous response, and was used to justify restrictive regulations for women throughout the country. It also fed the incipient eugenics movement, and provided the basis for great anxiety over whether the higher education of women would lead to the demise of American civilization, through the declining birthrate of college women.

21 See Haines, "For Honor and Alma Mater...", op. cit. It is interesting that while Sage nowhere states explicitly that using Sage College for classrooms would exclude women from the University, this assumption underlies the women's concern in their formal Memorial to the trustees, presented in 1885.

22 See Haines, "For Honor and Alma Mater....," op. cit.

23 Andrew Dickson White, speech at cornerstone ceremony for the first fraternity house in Ithaca, Psi Upsilon, reported in the Cornell Era, May 9, 1884; Minutes of the Board of Trustees, 1880-1890; Charles Kendall Adams, Report of the President of Cornell University for the Academic Year 1890-91; Henry W. Sage to Andrew Dickson White, August 17, 1879.

24 Report of the President...for 1897-98, ...for 1899-1900, for 1903-04.

25 See Cornell Era, November 1, 1872; January 29, 1875.

26 See Cornell Era, November 23, 1888.

27 The Era frequently urges students (meaning men) to run for class office and other leadership positions, because such experience trains them for future leadership of the country, for "independent manhood" (October 10, 1891). The Social Science Club was organized in 1879 specifically to develop "Manly Leaders" (November 28, 1879) - despite the fact that they admitted women to meetings.

Information on the women's activities seldom appeared in editorials or articles in the Era, or the Daily Sun. Announcements of their meetings, elections, trips to conventions, etc. appeared in the "Cornelliana" section, a collection of brief tidbits about student life in the Era. However, several

correspondence collections in the Cornell University Archives provide not only information on activities, but also insight into the feelings of the women toward college life. Particularly valuable are the weekly letters of Adelaide Taber Young to her family, 1895-99; Ruth and Gertrude Nelson to their family, 1891-1897; Evelyn Schuyler Schaeffer, "From Sunrise to Sunset," typewritten autobiography; Anna Botsford Comstock, "A Woman Student at Cornell University, 1874-1876," in The Comstocks of Cornell (Ithaca: 1953).

The papers of Martha Carey Thomas include a mutli-volume journal of her days at Cornell as both student and first woman trustee; but these papers will not be open to the scholarly public until 1980.

28 See, for example, Cornell Era, October 3, 1891; November 13, 1891; May 28, 1892.

29 Letters of Adelaide Taber Young, February 2, 1897.

30 ibid.

31 Criteria for selecting these various matrons, advisers, Warden, etc. were explicitly related to their manners, demeanor, and approximation of 'true womanhood'. See, for example, Charles Kendall Adams, Annual Report of the President, 1890-91; Jacob Gould Schurman, Seventh Annual Report of President Schurman, 1898-99; White and Sage, Circular to Women Students, 1884; Minutes of the Board of Trustees, 1879-80. Schurman's comments on Margaret Floy Washburn, the Warden, appear in Proceedings of the Board of Trustees, April 24, 1900; the following year Miss Washburn was appointed Lecturer in Psychology, with no salary. She soon thereafter left, to become a professor at Vassar.

32 Young and Nelson letters, throughout; see, for example of the men's response to "faculty ladies", Cornell Era, December 10, 1873.

33 Young and Nelson letters, throughout; Jacob Gould Schurman, Annual Report... 1899-1900.

34 See Schurman, Report of the President...1902-03 regarding controversy over faculty appointments for women, and Domestic Economy; Schurman, Report...1916-17, regarding faculty rejection of a request from the New York City alumnae organization for an increase in the number of female faculty.

35 Visits from alumnae were reported regularly in the Cornell Era; Young and Nelson letters contained numerous references to alumnae, aunts, sisters, cousins and friends who stayed in Sage College for various lengths of time, attending parties and classes. See also Records of the Federation of Cornell Women's Clubs, Cornell University Archives; and "Report of the Warden of Sage College," Annual Report of the President...1898-99.

36 One example of such a vicarious role model is the wide attention paid to visits to American campuses by Pundita Ramabai, an Indian woman reformer (Cornell Era, May-October, 1887). Her visits to Cornell and other schools prompted establishment of the Ramabai Circle, which met regularly to discuss the problems of women in India, to to raise money for her school. The Era

also reported on lectures by Susan B. Anthony (1878), and Belva Lockwood (January, 1891). Professor Lucy Salmon of Vassar College was reported as speaking before the History and Political Science Association (mostly men) in October, 1888, about "The Historical Side of Domestic Service".

37 For an example of how contemporary educators saw coeducation as "failing" the nation's women, as being anti-female and therefore a negative rather than progressive institution, see Henry T. Finck, "Why Co-Education is Losing Ground," Independent LV, Part I (February 12, 1903: 361-365.

On the "feminization" of education and its consequences for society, see Laura J. Runyon, "The Woman Peril in Education," Education Review XLVII (1914): 507-12, the first of a series of articles with this same title in this journal, all debating the pollution of masculinity by exposure to women under higher coeducation.

See also: William R. Harper, "Segregation at the University of Chicago," Report of the U.S. Commissioner of Education, 1903 (I, 1073-1074); Felix Adler, "The Differentiation of Higher Education for Women," Journal of the Association of Collegiate Alumnae (April, 1912); Theodore Roosevelt, Conservation of Womanhood and Childhood (New York: 1912); and Rebecca H. Davis and Catherine Owen, "Are Women to Blame?", N.A.R. (1889).

38 A Tribute to Henry W. Sage From the Women Graduates of Cornell University (Ithaca: 1895), Cornell University Archives.

39 Reports of casual social activities with their male classmates abound in the Young and Nelson letters. Evidence of anti-female attitudes on the part of male students abound in the Daily Sun, Era, Cornellian (yearbook), and numerous short-lived humor magazines. The editors of the major publications were all fraternity men, and there was annual debate over how representative of the entire student body their comments were.

An editorial in the Cornell Era on October 4, 1878 chastised the men for referring to Cornell women as "coeds" - and reminded them that in a coeducational school, all students are 'coeds', men as well as women. Le Conte Stevens, writing in 1883, felt that the term 'coed' would soon be discarded because of its derogatory implications (Admission of Women to Universities); and F.A.P. Barnard saw the term as "odious" ("Should American Colleges be Open to Women as Well as Men?", paper at the 20th Annual Convocation, University of the State of New York, Albany, 1882).

"The Myth of the Ugly Cornell Coed" was the title of a talk given by Professor Jennie Farley, Director of the Women's Studies Program and member of the faculty of the New York School of Industrial and Labor Relations, Cornell University in March 1977. Professor Farley's title was taken from Cornell student slang, which she noted had not changed since her undergraduate days at Cornell in the 1950's.

The figures on Cornell marriages have not yet been tabulated, but are a part of the Haines dissertation, in progress.

40 See Harper, op. cit.; and Woody, op. cit.

41 See Mary Ryan, Womanhood in America from Colonial Times to the Present (New York: 1975); Barbara Welter, The Woman Question in American History

(Hinsdale, Illinois: 1973); Carroll Smith-Rosenberg, "The Female World of Love and Ritual: Relations Between Women in Nineteenth Century America," SIGNS (Autumn, 1975). See also Christopher Lasch, "Woman as Alien," in The New Radicalism in America, 1889-1963; The Intellectual as Social Type (New York: 1965).

41a Ida Shaw Martin, The Sorority Handbook, 2nd Edition (np: 1907), 47-48.

42 See Schurman, Report of President Schurman...1899-1900, 1902-03, 1914-15, 1917-18. Gertrude Shorb Martin went on to edit the journal of the Association of Collegiate Alumnae from her home in Ithaca, writing and speaking of her experience with Cornell with some bitterness.

43 Elizabeth Fox-Genovese, "Is Sisterhood a Political Position?", paper presented at the Spring meeting of the Upstate New York Women's History Conference, February 24, 1979, Rochester, New York.

44 See Daniel Scott Smith, "Family Limitation, Sexual Control and Domestic Feminism in Victorian America," Feminist Studies I (Winter/Spring, 1973); Mary Ryan, op. cit; Ellen DuBois, Feminism and Suffrage: The Emergence of An Independent Women's Movement in America, 1848-1869(thaca: 1978).

45 White, Report Submitted to the Trustees... (1872); Schurman, Report of President Schurman...1902-03.

46 Sage and White discussed the importance of controlling the influence of the matron, Lady Principal, etc. through careful hiring of appropriately "ladylike" women for these positions (see for example, Sage to White, August 17, 1879). Henry Sage invited a few of the more conservative women at Sage College to his home in 1878, to lay the foundations for the Sage College Women's Self-Government Association (see Minutes of the Board of Trustees, 1878). Sage's general ideals for women's education are elucidated by Martha Carey Thomas in a speech at the Memorial Exercises for Henry W. Sage, Ithaca, 1898 (Cornell University Archives).

47 Digest of Educational Statistics, 1973 Edition.

48 The author is indebted for the theoretical framework of this paper to discussion with Elizabeth Fox-Genovese, Sarah Elbert, Maxine Seller, Michael Katz, and Frederick Stutz. A more detailed discussion of student life and achievement saliance for women was developed in "Coeducation and the Development of Leadership Skills in Women," in Sari Knopp Biklin, ed., Women and Educational Leadership (forthcoming).